

### **REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 have been amended solely to correct informalities. Accordingly, claims 1-8 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 4 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 6-8 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

#### ***Claim Objection***

In the Office Action, claims 6-8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 6-8 have not been amended because Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-8 depend from an allowable base claim and are allowable at least for this reason.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,369,516 issued to Iketsu *et al.* ("Iketsu"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection improper.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 4 must be withdrawn because Iketsu fails to disclose every claimed feature of claims 1 and 4. Specifically, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein the booting current:

...

has instantaneous values which are kept constant; and  
has an application time amount that for the booting current is proportional to a magnitude change of each display data signal in the next horizontal drive time period with respect to the display data signal in the current horizontal drive time period

Iketsu fails to teach or suggest at least these features. Rather, Iketsu teaches a device that includes a blanking period to selectively discharge residual electric charges in individual data electrodes instead of discharging residual electric charges in all data electrodes. (col. 4, lines 11-14). To this end, comparator 1i compares the signal voltage of a current display period with the signal voltage of a next display period. (Fig. 2; col. 4, lines 50-56). If the signal voltage of the current display period exceeds the signal voltage of the next display period, the residual electric charges of the corresponding data electrode are discharged. (col. 4, lines 63-67). Conversely, if the signal voltage of the current display period is less than the signal voltage of the next display period, the residual electric charges of the corresponding data electrode are *not* discharged. (col. 4, line 67 – col. 5, line 2). The residual electric charges are discharged from a data electrode by turning on a discharge circuit, thereby grounding the data electrode. (col. 5, lines 3-4). In Iketsu's first embodiment, "discharge circuit 3i [is] composed of switching circuits." (Fig. 2; col. 6, lines 26-27). In Iketsu's second embodiment, "discharge circuit 30i has a resistance and the comparator circuit 1i controls the resistance value of the discharge circuit 30i." (Fig. 7; col. 7, lines 1-4).

Iketsu fails to disclose at least a booting current that "has instantaneous values *which are kept constant*." (claim 1, line 11, emphasis added). Iketsu's first embodiment is silent with regard to current values. Iketsu merely teaches that either "electric charges accumulated in the

pixel  $P(i, j)$  are discharged” (col. 6, lines 28-29) or “electric charges accumulated in the pixel  $P(i, j)$  are *not* discharged.” (col. 6, lines 36-37, emphasis added). On the other hand, Iketsu’s second embodiment explicitly teaches varying currents. Specifically, “the smaller the  $D(i, j)$  value is, the larger the current volume discharged through the discharged [sic] circuit 30i is restricted.” (col. 7, lines 14-16). Thus, Iketsu fails to disclose a booting current with “instantaneous values which are kept constant.”

Iketsu also fails to disclose at least a booting current that “has an *application time amount that ... is proportional to* a magnitude change of each display data signal in the next horizontal drive time period with respect to the display data signal in the current horizontal drive time period.” (claim 1, lines 12-14, emphasis added). Rather, Iketsu teaches blanking pulses and blanking periods that have a fixed duration. (Fig. 3). Thus, Iketsu fails to disclose every claimed feature of claim 1.

Claim 4 has similar limitations to those of claim 1 noted above. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is allowable over Iketsu for at least the reasons noted above with regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection of claims 1 and 4. Claims 2-3 and 5 depend from claims 1 or 4 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 4, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

### ***Other Matters***

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 have been amended solely for the purposes of informality correction, better wording, and clarification. These amendments are not made for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is

intended. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: April 6, 2007

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027**

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: 703-288-5105  
Fax: 703-288-5139  
HCP/RTS/alj